

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 199

July 18, 1996, 10:06 am
Page S-8066 Temp. Record

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS/F-16 Funds to Anti-Terrorism Program

SUBJECT: Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997 . . . S. 1894. Stevens motion to table the Levin amendment No. 4893.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 58-41

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1894, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997, will appropriate \$244.74 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year (FY) 1997, which is \$10.2 billion more than requested and \$1.33 billion more than the FY 1996 funding level.

The Levin amendment would reduce funding for the procurement of F-16 aircraft by \$48 million, and would provide that no more than 6 new F-16 aircraft could be procured using funds from this Act. It would then increase by \$48 million the \$14 million in funding that will be provided by this Act for a new anti-terrorism program, contingent upon its being authorized. (The bill will provide funding to procure 8 F-16s; the President requested funding to purchase 4 F-16s. The Defense Department currently spends \$1 billion annually on military security forces).

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Stevens moved to table the Levin amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Levin amendment has nothing to do with anti-terrorism. We inform our colleagues that the Defense Department budgets approximately \$1 billion for military security forces whose primary mission is to prevent terrorism. Antiterrorism funding is also included in the Commerce Appropriations Bill, the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Bill, and the Transportation Appropriations Bill. The need to prevent terrorism and to punish terrorists is not being overlooked. Senators should rest assured that the Levin amendment's increase in funding for anti-terrorism efforts is not needed. Funding is needed, however, for 8 F-16s. In fact, providing that funding will not come anywhere close to meeting our military requirements for those planes. Since the collapse of the Soviet

(See other side)

YEAS (58)			NAYS (41)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (48 or 91%)		Democrats (10 or 22%)	Republicans (5 or 9%)	Democrats (36 or 78%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Ashcroft	Helms	Akaka	Abraham	Baucus	Kerry		Bumpers- ²
Bennett	Hutchison	Biden	Hatfield	Bingaman	Kohl		
Bond	Inhofe	Breaux	Jeffords	Boxer	Lautenberg		
Brown	Kassebaum	Dodd	Lugar	Bradley	Leahy		
Burns	Kempthorne	Heflin	McCain	Bryan	Levin		
Campbell	Kyl	Hollings		Byrd	Mikulski		
Chafee	Lott	Inouye		Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Coats	Mack	Johnston		Daschle	Murray		
Cochran	McConnell	Lieberman		Dorgan	Nunn		
Cohen	Murkowski	Moynihan		Exon	Pell		
Coverdell	Nickles			Feingold	Pryor		
Craig	Pressler			Feinstein	Reid		
D'Amato	Roth			Ford	Robb		
DeWine	Santorum			Glenn	Rockefeller		
Domenici	Shelby			Graham	Sarbanes		
Faircloth	Simpson			Harkin	Simon		
Frahm	Smith			Kennedy	Wellstone		
Frist	Snowe			Kerrey	Wyden		
Gorton	Specter						
Gramm	Stevens						
Grams	Thomas						
Grassley	Thompson						
Gregg	Thurmond						
Hatch	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Union, the United States' military policy has been to have defense forces capable of fighting and winning 2 major regional conflicts at once. According to General Ralston, who is now the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the United States has 120 too few F-16s to be able to meet that policy. This bill will still result in a shortfall of 112 planes; the Levin amendment would result in a shortfall of 114 planes. We are not pleased with any shortfall in this area or in any other defense area, but we are accepting them in virtually every area because the majority of our colleagues, and the President, just are not willing to provide enough money. One of the few areas that is receiving adequate funding is the area of counter-terrorism. We are therefore not willing to cut funding for 2 F-16s in order to increase funding for counter-terrorism efforts, and accordingly support the motion to table the Levin amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Levin amendment would take the funding in this bill for 2 F-16 aircraft and would spend it on the emergency anti-terrorism program that will be created by this Act. The Levin amendment is about priorities. The Pentagon, to maintain its fighter force, asked for 4 F-16 fighters this year. When it was asked to prepare a wish list saying what it would like to spend if it had more money available, it asked for 2 additional F-16s. This bill will provide money for 8 F-16s. We do not deny that 8 new F-16s would be beneficial, but we do deny that buying 8 would serve any great need. Spending more on anti-terrorism efforts, on the other hand, is a very high priority, as demonstrated by the recent terrorist bombing in Saudi Arabia. Over the past several years, funding for defense anti-terrorism efforts has declined by \$48 million. This amendment would bring funding for those efforts back up to the former funding level. The Levin amendment would move defense funds from an area of low priority to an area of high priority. We urge Senators to give it their support.